

**EIGHTH DAY**  
(Monday, July 24, 1978)

The Senate met at 10:30 o'clock a.m., pursuant to adjournment and was called to order by the President.

The roll was called and the following Senators were present: Aikin, Andujar, Blake, Braecklein, Brooks, Clower, Creighton, Doggett, Farabee, Hance, Harris, Jones of Harris, Jones of Taylor, Kothmann, Lombardino, Longoria, Mauzy, McKnight, Meier, Mengden, Ogg, Parker, Patman, Price, Santiesteban, Schwartz, Snelson, Traeger, Truan, Williams.

Absent-excused: Moore.

A quorum was announced present.

Rabbi Neal Borovitz of the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation, Austin, offered the invocation as follows:

Elohaynu Vaylohey Avotanu V'Ematanu

Our God and the God of our Patriarchs and Matriarchs.

We ask Your blessing upon the men and women of this legislative assembly. The Members of the Texas Senate have the awesome burden of writing laws which will be just and yet merciful. May they be inspired with wisdom to avoid the frivolous and concentrate on the real needs of our people. May they always act out of wisdom tempored only by a true love for all mankind.

Ribono She Olam

Master of the Universe we live in an age when all men are not free. When the basic human rights of our brethern in Soviet Russia and many other lands are blatantly ignored and mocked may we who live here in this the land of the free and the home of the brave retain the courage and determination to demand freedom for all.

Adonai Oz L'amo Yitain

Adonai Yivorach et Amo B'Shalom.

May the Lord give strength unto his people. May the Lord bless the Members of this Senate and all people with peace.

On motion of Senator Aikin and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 20, 1978, was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

Senator Moore was granted leave of absence for today on account of important business on motion of Senator McKnight.

**MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE**

House Chamber

July 24, 1978

Honorable William P. Hobby  
President of the Senate

Sir: I am directed by the House to inform the Senate that the House has passed the following:

The House refused to concur in Senate amendments to House Bill No. 1 and has requested the appointment of a Conference Committee to consider the differences between the two Houses.

House Conferees: Wyatt, Davis, Schlueter, Atkinson, Tejada.

**H.C.R. 3**, Granting permission to Jack Davis, et ux., to sue the state.

**H.C.R. 4**, Granting permission to Bruce Anderson and Cecil R. Payne to sue the state.

**H.C.R. 12**, Commending Rusty Kelley.

**H.C.R. 13**, Memorializing Congress to initiate a constitutional amendment requiring a balanced federal budget.

Respectfully,

BETTY MURRAY, Chief Clerk  
House of Representatives

### SENATE RESOLUTION 66

Senator Mauzy offered the following resolution:

WHEREAS, it is with great delight that the Members of the Texas Senate pause to take note of the birthday on the twenty-first day of July of our distinguished colleague and friend from the Seventh Senatorial District of Texas; and

WHEREAS, this day marks the forty-fourth anniversary of the birth of the Honorable Gene Jones; and

WHEREAS, Senator Jones' presence and leadership in his Senate duties have earned him the respect, friendship and admiration of each member; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED by the Senate of the State of Texas, 65th Legislature, Second Called Session, that most sincere greetings and congratulations be extended to our friend and colleague Gene Jones on this, his forty-fourth birthday; and be it further

RESOLVED, that this Resolution be presented to Gene as a token of the best wishes of the Senate for many more happy, healthy and productive years of continued outstanding service to his district and to the people of Texas.

The resolution was read.

On motion of Senator Brooks and by unanimous consent, the names of the Lieutenant Governor and Senators were added to the resolution as signers thereto.

On motion of Senator Mauzy and by unanimous consent, the resolution was considered immediately and was adopted.

**SENATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS ON FIRST READING**

The following bills and resolutions were introduced, read first time and referred to the Committee indicated:

**S.B. 11** by Kothmann Education  
Relating to the teaching hospital for The University of Texas Medical School at San Antonio; amending Section 74.154, Texas Education Code.

**S.B. 12** by Moore State Affairs  
Relating to the sale of certain property by the Texas Board of Corrections and the purchase of new land with proceeds from the sale, or to the exchange of the property for other land; reappropriating money deposited in the special fund; and amending Sections 1 through 4, Chapter 457, Acts of the 54th Legislature, 1955.

**S.B. 13** by Jones of Taylor Finance  
Relating to transfer of the land, buildings, facilities, and other property of the Gatesville State School for Boys to the Texas Department of Corrections; making appropriations and providing for transfer of funds.

**S.B. 14** by Meier, Hance Finance  
Relating to the creation and distribution of the School Property Tax Relief fund; adding Section 15.13 to Chapter 15 of the Texas Education Code; and amending Article 20.13, Title 122A, Taxation—General, Revised Civil Statutes of Texas, 1925, as amended.

**S.B. 15** by Meier, Hance Finance  
Relating to the creation of the School Property Tax Relief fund; providing for the dedication of certain sales tax revenues for the maintenance and operations of local school districts; providing for local ad valorem property tax reductions; amending Article 20.13, Title 122A, Taxation—General, Revised Civil Statutes of Texas, as amended; and declaring an emergency.

**S.J.R. 13** by Moore Finance  
Proposing a constitutional amendment authorizing the legislature to exempt up to \$10,000 of the value of all residence homesteads from school district taxes and requiring exemption from school district taxes of at least \$10,000 of the value of the residence homesteads of the elderly.

**S.R. 67** by Brooks Administration  
Creating a special interim committee to study the human services delivery system in Texas.

**CONFERENCE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE BILL 1**

Senator Hance called from the President's table for consideration at this time, the request of the House for a Conference Committee to adjust the differences between the two Houses on **H.B. 1** and moved that the request be granted.

The motion prevailed.

The President asked if there were any motions to instruct the Conference Committee on **H.B. 1** before appointment.

There were no motions offered.

Accordingly, the President announced the appointment of the following conferees on the part of the Senate on the bill: Senators Hance, Lombardino, Aikin, Farabee, Jones of Taylor.

### PRESENTATION OF GUEST

Pursuant to the provisions of **S.R. 38**, the President announced the time had arrived for the address of Dr. Gian C. Sud, Director of International Education Center at Western Michigan University.

The President presented President Pro Tempore Longoria who presented Dr. Sud to the Members of the Senate.

Dr. Sud then addressed the Senate.

Senator Longoria expressed the appreciation of the Senate to Dr. Sud.

On motion of Senator Aikin and by unanimous consent, the remarks of Dr. Sud were ordered reduced to writing and entered in the Journal as follows:

First of all, Senator Longoria, Mr. President, thank you very much. If I am a little nervous, I hope you will forgive me for this because it's not everyday that a college teacher gets a chance to talk to an august body such as the Texas Senate. I'll try to do my very best in sharing the contents and thoughts that I have with you.

It's indeed a rare privilege and a pleasure to be here in this great state, and I mean the word "great" state sincerely for more than one reason. Throughout my work for the last three years, the name Texas, along with California and North Carolina, keeps coming up very prominently and this is where it all started.

The main theme of what I have to submit to your consideration falls in two categories; number one, education; number two, trade. Now, my personal involvement, or concern if you will, is more as a result of the love for this country, and a feeling that perhaps we are missing out on our share. I am presently engaged in writing a book entitled "While America Sleeps" because there is so much opportunity being missed, and those are the reasons for which the motivation was to develop international education and international trade.

If my comments are a little bit strong that is perhaps also understandable because usually a recent convert is always stronger than the Pope, and perhaps I'm no exception.

Now, the history of, history and evolution of education have clearly shown that many nations, particularly the industrialized and civilized nations, place a great emphasis and priority on education. Not only higher education, but also K through 12. There is no exception to this. The Middle Eastern countries, which have become recently rich, want to do the things that England, U.S.A., Germany and so on did in order to bring about the uplift and progress of their people. They want to share two things basically with the United States trade and higher education. Of course, as is understandable, they want both those things on favorable terms.

The question then becomes — two questions actually. One, should the United States be willing to share its know-how and science education and technology with them? Two, what kind of trade terms should the United States be willing to consider before entering into any arrangements?

Let me try to answer those two questions separately. First, on education.

Education has been placed in such a situation that everyone assumes that it is going to be education, science and technology which will solve the problems of the developing nations. What if they don't? One shudders at the thought of a multitudian solution, where perhaps shipload after shipload of Indians or Chinese, just for an instance, were to come unannounced to the shores of U.S., Canada or Britain, or what have you, what is the solution? Shoot them down? Or, simply accept them? Do we have the resources to accept this multitudian alternative? The answer seems to be no.

The second alternative is help them in such a way that they can bring about their own societal benefits, societal uplift, through education, science and technology, and this is where I concentrate in the paper on U.S. — this is simply an illustration, U.S., Arab educational cooperation.

Beginning in the 1960's, but particularly 1973 because of the now famous oil embargo by the OPEC Nations, there has been a tremendous shift in the capital distribution in the world. I don't need to tell you this. I'm sure all of you who have traveled or seen movies of where sometimes even Rolls Royces are given as a tip to the driver, the wealth is there.

At an early stage, these nations in which I have personal experience, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Libya, to some extent Iran and Nigeria, in these — earlier they decided that education is going to be the vehicle through which they are going to enter the 21st Century. An examination of their annual budgets clearly indicates the high priority they have placed on education, science and technology.

American education has influenced them greatly. Over 50% of executives, leaders, high officials in the government are American trained. And there is a concerted effort in what they call Americanization of these different nations.

Now, the question is why should the United States become involved in the education of the Middle East? I submit that it is advantageous from every standpoint, political consideration. The theory I have on that is the best salesman for freedom and democracy is an educated person who has a well-trained analytical mind.

In conversations with hundreds of citizens, if not essentially government leaders, one thing becomes very clear. The Arabs, the Africans.... I'm not speaking of the government level, I'm speaking at the educational level, people-to-people level.... they are simply fascinated with the American system of education and what it has done to create a free and impartial society to the extent that they can see it.

Now then, there are economic considerations. With the huge amount of wealth, they have decided to offer very attractive scholarships and stipends for those students who wish to proceed abroad for higher education. The question is, do the American universities want to cooperate in training of these students, because if we don't, they can always go elsewhere. And as a study of the greater — the British Council on Higher Education reveals, that their benefits are great.

Another study that we conducted at Western Michigan University indicates that an average student from these nations means \$17,800 per year to the community. And incidentally, this does not include one sample student who happened to buy 100 cars in one year to send back home to his folks.

Then, there are social cultural considerations. With the wealth that has shifted to that part of the world, there are people who are continuously traveling. Americans are traveling. There is going to be for the next ten to twenty years, or at least for the foreseeable future, a tremendous interchange between the Americans and the Middle Easterns. Perhaps it will be to our advantage to understand more about their cultures, systems, education, science and technology.

Now, what is the American position? In a conference recently held in Washington, D.C., sponsored by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the main theme was the changing international education scene. Goals, priorities and funding. It was attended by very high dignitaries of the federal government, the state governments and colleges and universities.

The main thrust was that whether we like it or not, America would have to become involved in global education. At this point I would like to make an arbitrary distinction between the two terms global education and international education.

Global education, the way I have defined in this paper, basically is that part of the education through which the American students learn about the rest of the world. Their geographies, histories, economies, education and so on.

International education, on the other hand, is where we, our institutions become involved in the training of people from other nations.

Suppose a state such as Texas or North Carolina or California were to become involved in international education on a bigger scale, and as I submitted earlier, perhaps we should. My paper makes a case for our becoming involved. I'll try to explain a little bit more on that later. We will have some problems. Those problems are, number one, educational resources. Are there adequate physical facilities? Are there adequate administrative set-ups?

The answer is, as I will try to justify with data, yes, we do have them.

The second aspect that needs to be considered is financial resources. This may not be essentially true of the so-called Sun Belt, but in the rest of the country the data seemed to indicate that particularly because of the 1974-75 so-called "mini-recession", many colleges and universities had to undertake a severe belt-tightening. And as a result, there may be some financial difficulties if one were to engage in international education. However, that is also justifiable.

In analysis of these two things, there are two factors which are becoming very clear. Number one, that the American population is declining, or has been declining since 1968. The figure I picked up from the Statistical Abstract of the U.S. Department of Commerce, indicates that from 1971 to 1976 the population has decreased — the population increase proportion, has decreased from 17.2% to 14.7%. So, we are almost approaching a zero population base.

In view of the declining population there is declining enrollment on many colleges and universities. As a result buildings are empty, some faculty members are being laid off. As a matter of fact, there are several institutions in which tenure faculty has been laid off through legal and proper channels.

So, in summary then, we do have the physical resources, we do have the personnel resources. The only thing we have to concern ourselves with is the financial resources.

Dr. Alfred Moye, the Deputy Commissioner of Education, in the U.S. Office of Education, in his talk in Washington, proposed that there are two sources of funding for international education. One is the federal government, and the other is the institutions themselves. In a debate then we seem to agree that there is indeed a third source and that is the requesting nations themselves. They are willing to subsidize many of the projects that our universities and colleges care to undertake. This is the source that I submit for your consideration that we should examine and take advantage of.

What is the current status of international education? As you well know, the American institutions of higher education are extremely diffuse and extremely populist. It is very hard for a foreign official to get information from a centralized source. If you and I were to go into a different country, all one would have to do is talk to the Minister of Education, at least in theory we can get all the answers. But, if a foreign official were to come here to get information on American higher

education, he simply could not do it from a central source. Harvard is as different from Texas as it is from Stamford...of course the basic thrust is the same...but the diffused and population nature is there nevertheless.

In spite of these difficulties, let it be said to the credit of our colleges and universities that we have done extremely well as compared to England, Germany, France and the U.S., put together. This is due to two reasons. One, our education is extremely flexible, which has allowed the Arab students, the Middle Eastern students, the African students to get the kind of training that was most sensitive to their particular needs or their country's needs.

Secondly, our professoriate, the lecturers, the assistant professors, the associate professors, were willing to extend the day to any length in order to get the job done for these foreign students. Still, we need to ask the question. If our universities have to become involved in the higher education of the other nations, what is the best mechanism by which a state or its university can do the job, do the job profitably and most effectively?

I submit in order to accomplish the task at hand what we need to do is have a centralized administrative set-up. Now, it has always been a question in my mind that the American legislative bodies, either at the state level or at the federal level perhaps, contribute as much, if not more, in most cases perhaps even more, to the process of education and economy as the executive branch itself. And yet, the executive branch has the benefit of advisement from different sources.

For instance, the president's office has access to, or had actually a branch of it, the science advisor, and education advisor. Whereas most of the legislative bodies do not have such advisory offices for their benefit, they have to depend on the consultants which they hire from time to time.

I was awfully pleased to note that the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania has now set up two offices. One is called the Office of Science Affairs. The second, Office of Educational Affairs.

Now, if a state were to establish that, then the universities will have to make a determination as to how, or what kind of administrative procedures they would set up which will best meet the needs of the foreign clientele that will spend anywhere from five to seven years working for a degree in a given state or a given university.

On summarizing this, because Senator Longoria told me that I should try to keep it to 20 to 30 minutes, rather than one hour to one hour, fifteen minutes, this might be a part of the reason for being a bit sketchy.

What are the advantages for us? Advantages can be defined at the following levels:

1. There will be tremendous benefits for the faculty development. The faculty could have personal benefits in the form of honoraria that they receive, the travel benefits that they can accrue by going to these countries at their expenses.
2. There could be semi-professional benefits. A particular faculty member may be interested in a particular research that he might simply want to understand without becoming involved.
3. The faculty members would definitely have professional benefits in terms of research, solar energy, for instance, that they will engage in. For the university the benefit is scholarly; tremendous amount of interscholarship exchange would occur. But, more important than that, the universities would develop a good source of alumni who will be the future contributors to the programs of the university.

Each foreign student, each guest from abroad, significantly contributes to the community in which he lives. I have given you some data on the basis of Kalamazoo, Michigan. Each student from the Middle East means \$17,800 per year, in addition to the educational revenues that he pays.

What are the state benefits? One of the things that I'm going to conclude with is our trade relationship with the other countries, and if more students are exposed to a given state, this state would have a built-in advantage in developing trade relationships abroad. And from what I read in the newspapers, many governors are interested in establishing trade relationships with different countries in view of the high unemployment and the deficit of payments. And of course, this is not my concern, this is your concern. I'll simply refer this point to your attention. There will be a certain amount of political, residual benefit. After all, American system is free, and it is as bold and brave as perhaps a human mind can envision, with its difficulties and limitations. Then again, who does not have limitations and difficulties?

Wouldn't it be advantageous for us to expose those people to our system which has functioned so well in the last 200 years?

Another thing that puzzled me the most, I pay a little attention to that, during my work spending over three years, two things struck me the most. One is the tremendous admiration and praise in which we, the Americans, are held by the Arabs and by the Africans. Again, I'm not talking about intergovernmental relationships. I'm talking about business, education and people-to-people relationships.

In spite of that, one is simply wonder-struck by the absence of American goods and services that you find in the Middle East. I started collecting some data and only 16% of all the goods and services imported by the oil rich nations, or the metal rich nations, are from the United States. Once again, being a recent convert, the question that occurred to me is why are our products inferior? Are our services inferior? Then on further analysis, the interesting part is of the other 84% of the goods and services that you see, the distribution is strangely lopsided, approximately 17% goes to Asia, the balance of it ends up in China, Korea and Japan.

Now, again, I'm not a trade expert. I will simply leave you with the data. I'm sure you have all the expertise at your command.

The point from here is that this is a tremendously valuable market which needs to be explored. On the one hand, in our own country I have a brother, I have a son, I have a daughter...in our own country we had a high unemployment of 9%, which is down to right around 6% now. We have a deficit of 45%. Then you travel in Kuwait or Saudi Arabia and you read that their surplus is running approximately \$10 to \$12 billion a year. The total surplus of all the Arab nations, according to Kuwait Times, added up to \$31 billion last year.

Why then are we not doing more to get some of that money back? The press is full of the stories that if our Congress passes the energy bill, all our ills will be cured. I'm not sure. I'm reminded of a married couple, husband is making \$30,000 or his wife is making \$30,000, husband is spending \$50,000...there's a deficit of \$20,000. You holler and holler, you save \$10,000, there is still a deficit of \$10,000. The bottom line is somebody needs to go out and earn \$10,000 more. Even if you economize on energy, and we cut some of it, some of our bills down, I'm not sure if the \$45 billion deficit can be simply reduced.

My theory here is a researchable academic theory, that what we need to do is go out and earn more. We need to improve upon our 60% of the share that we presently hold.

There is another theory that was in the New York Times just a few weeks ago, that what will happen when the oil runs out? I would like to submit this simply for your consideration. Once again a researchable aspect. If indeed the surplus of the oil rich nations is \$30 billion a year, and they do keep the oil for 20 years, that will be a surplus of \$600 billion. If they wisely invest in General Motors, General Electric and IBM, at even 7% return, they will never be poor. We will do the hard work, they will have the dividend checks going to them. The point I'm trying to



make, I think, is that we need to develop at the state level, at the local level, and perhaps even at the government level...I'm not that smart yet to determine that...to develop trade situation whereby we can improve upon our 16% of the share.

In closing these are the two thoughts I had. The two vehicles through which we can improve are: physical posture in that part of the world, or international education, students, services, consultants, and through more aggressive trade relationships between one American state, two American states, or the whole nation and the requesting nations such as Kuwait or Saudi Arabia.

In conclusion, Senator Longoria, my deepest appreciation and gratitude to the Senators of this great State of Texas, I'm really honored and privileged that I had this opportunity to share some brief thoughts with you.

Thank you very much.

### PRESENTATION OF GUEST

The President presented to the Members of the Senate Miss Elizabeth Oaks, daughter of Secretary of State Steve Oaks.

### HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 13

Senator Hance asked unanimous consent to suspend all necessary rules to take up for consideration at this time:

**H.C.R. 13**, Memorializing Congress to initiate a constitutional amendment requiring a balanced federal budget.

There was objection.

Senator Hance then moved to suspend all necessary rules to take up **H.C.R. 13** for consideration at this time.

The motion prevailed by the following vote: Yeas 27, Nays 2.

Yeas: Aikin, Andujar, Blake, Braecklein, Brooks, Clower, Creighton, Farabee, Hance, Harris, Jones of Harris, Jones of Taylor, Kothmann, Lombardino, Longoria, McKnight, Meier, Mengden, Ogg, Patman, Price, Santiesteban, Schwartz, Snelson, Traeger, Truan, Williams.

Nays: Mauzy, Parker.

Absent: Doggett.

Absent-excused: Moore.

The President then laid the resolution before the Senate on its second reading.

The resolution was read and was adopted.

### RECORD OF VOTES

Senators Mauzy and Parker asked to be recorded as voting "Nay" on the adoption of the resolution.

### HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 12

On motion of Senator McKnight and by unanimous consent, all necessary rules were suspended to take up for consideration at this time:

**H.C.R. 12**, Commending Rusty Kelley for his distinguished service to the House and the Senate of the Texas Legislature.

The resolution was read and was adopted.

### HOUSE RESOLUTIONS ON FIRST READING

The following resolutions received from the House, were read the first time and referred to the Committee indicated:

**H.C.R. 4**, To Committee on Administration.

**H.C.R. 3**, To Committee on Administration.

### PRESENTATION OF GUESTS

Senator Santiesteban presented to the Members of the Senate the following guests from El Paso: Mr. Hal Daugherty, Mr. Jimmy Pick and Mr. David Stanford.

### MEMORIAL RESOLUTION

**S.R. 68** - By Snelson, Farabee: Memorial resolution for Judge William L. Kerr.

### WELCOME AND CONGRATULATORY RESOLUTIONS

**S.R. 65** - By Doggett: Extending welcome to Rabbi Neal Borovitz.

**S.R. 69** - By Aikin: Extending congratulations to Roy Herman.

### ADJOURNMENT

On motion of Senator Aikin the Senate at 11:17 o'clock a.m. adjourned until 10:00 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

### NINTH DAY (Tuesday, July 25, 1978)

The Senate met at 10:00 o'clock a.m., pursuant to adjournment and was called to order by the President.

The roll was called and the following Senators were present: Aikin, Andujar, Blake, Braecklein, Brooks, Clower, Creighton, Doggett, Farabee, Hance, Harris, Jones of Harris, Jones of Taylor, Kothmann, Lombardino, Longoria, Mauzy, McKnight, Meier, Mengden, Ogg, Parker, Patman, Price, Santiesteban, Schwartz, Snelson, Traeger, Truan, Williams.